DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 520 UD 024 873

AUTHOR	Hawkins, J. David; And Others
TITLE	A Typology of Cause-Focused Strategies of Delinquency Prevention. Reports of the National Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Law and Justice.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Dept. of Justice/LEAA), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 80
GRANT	77NI-99-0017
NOTE	51p.; For earlier reports, see ED 204 697 and ED 210 541.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Classification; Crime Prevention; *Delinquency Causes; *Delinquency Prevention; Policy Formation; Program Design

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a cause-focused typology of 12 delinquency prevention strategies to serve as a system for organizing and conceptualizing delinquency prevention efforts. These strategies are conceptually distinct and have been designed to facilitate systematic planning and evaluation of prevention efforts and to allow for comparative assessments of the relative effects of different prevention approaches. Each strategy is based on an assumption regarding the cause of delinquency and presumes a goal of intervention aimed at modifying or eleminating the cause. The 12 strategies are: (1) biological/physiological, (2) psychological/mental health, (3) social network development, (4) criminal influence reduction, (5) power enhancement, (6) role development/role enhancement, (7) activities/recreation, (8) education/skill development, (9) clear and consistent social expectations, (10) economic resource, (11) deterrence, and (12) abandonment of legal control/social tolerance. The paper defines delinquency and prevention, discusses the need for a typology of prevention strategies, reviews prior efforts to conceptualize delinquency prevention, and describes in detail the 12 strategies. Six pages of references conclude the report. (CG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. Department of Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

ED269520

Reports of the National Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers

A Typology of Cause-Focused Strategies of Delinquency Prevention

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD024873

Reports to Date in the Assessment Center Series:

From the Center on the Juvenile Justice System:

A Preliminary National Assessment of Child Abuse and Neglect and the Juvenile Justice System: The Shadows of Distress

A Preliminary National Assessment of the Status Offender and the Juvenile Justice System: Role Conflicts, Constraints, and Information Gaps

A National Assessment of Case Disposition and Classification in the Juvenile Justice System: Inconsistent Labeling

- Volume I — Process Description and Summary
- Volume II — Results of a Literature Search
- Volume III — Results of a Survey

A National Assessment of Serious Juvenile Crime and the Juvenile Justice System: The Need for a Rational Response

- Volume I — Summary
- Volume II — Definition, Characteristics of Incidents and Individuals, and Relationship to Substance Abuse
- Volume III — Legislation, Jurisdiction, Program Interventions, and Confidentiality of Juvenile Records
- Volume IV — Economic Impact

From the Center on Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing:

Juveniles in Detention Centers and Jails: An Analysis of State Variations During the Mid-1970's

From the Center on Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention:

A Typology of Cause-Focused Strategies of Delinquency Prevention

Alternative Education: Exploring the Delinquency Prevention Potential

Jurisdiction and the Elusive Status Offender: A Comparison of Involvement in Delinquent Behavior and Status Offenses

An Assessment of Evaluations of Drug Abuse Prevention Programs

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Experiments: A Review and Analysis

U.S. Department of Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Reports of the National Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers

A Typology of Cause-Focused Strategies of Delinquency Prevention

by
J. David Hawkins
Paul A. Pastor, Jr.
Michelle Bell
Sheila Morrison

June 1980

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

This report was prepared by the National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention of the Center for Law and Justice, University of Washington, under Grant Number 77NI-99-0017 from the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Copyright © 1979
Center for Law and Justice

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate, or otherwise use and to authorize others to publish and use, all or any part of the copyrighted materials contained in this publication.

CONTENTS

		Page
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vi
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BASIC CONCEPTS	3
III.	DELINQUENCY POLICY AND CAUSE-FOCUSED STRATEGIES: THE NEED FOR A NEW TYPOLOGY	5
IV.	PRIOR EFFORTS TO CONCEPTUALIZE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION	9
V.	CAUSE-FOCUSED STRATEGIES	11
	A. BIOLOGICAL/PHYSIOLOGICAL	11
	B. PSYCHOLOGICAL/MENTAL HEALTH	12
	C. SOCIAL NETWORK DEVELOPMENT	14
	D. CRIMINAL INFLUENCE REDUCTION	16
	E. POWER ENHANCEMENT	17
	F. ROLE DEVELOPMENT/ROLE ENHANCEMENT	18
	G. ACTIVITIES/RECREATION	20
	H. EDUCATION/SKILL DEVELOPMENT	20
	I. CLEAR AND CONSISTENT SOCIAL EXPECTATIONS	21
	J. ECONOMIC RESOURCE	22
	K. DETERRENCE	23
	L. ABANDONMENT OF LEGAL CONTROL/SOCIAL TOLERANCE	24
VI.	CAUSE-FOCUSED VERSUS TRADITIONAL STRATEGIES	27
VII.	THE UTILITY OF A CAUSE-FOCUSED TYPOLOGY FOR PREVENTION PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION	29
VIII.	CONCLUSION	31
APPENDIX:	PREVENTION PROGRAM DIMENSIONS	33
REFERENCES		37

FOREWORD

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 and its Amendments of 1977 mandated the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to assume leadership in planning for delinquency prevention. Recognizing prior difficulties in conceptualizing and developing effective prevention approaches, the Act also mandated a systematic gathering and assessment of data on the causes, prevention, and treatment of juvenile delinquency to serve as a foundation for planning prevention policies and programs. To fulfill these mandates, the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention within the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention established the Assessment Centers Programs.

This paper, a product of the National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention, provides (1) a much needed typology for conceptualizing and organizing approaches to delinquency prevention according to the causes of delinquency they address and (2) a framework for systematically planning and evaluating delinquency prevention efforts. This typology will provide a solid empirical basis for achieving the goal of developing an effective technology of delinquency prevention. I encourage those interested in the field of prevention to use this conceptual tool in their prevention effort.

James C. Howell, Ph.D., Director
National Institute for Juvenile
Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 and the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1977 established the prevention of juvenile delinquency as a national priority. Yet, a proven technology of delinquency prevention is lacking.

To develop such a technology, a system for organizing and conceptualizing delinquency prevention efforts is needed. It should orient delinquency prevention planning, programing, and evaluation in order to facilitate the formulation of policies which encourage development of increasingly effective prevention programs.

Such a system can emerge from understanding the concept of prevention itself. Delinquency prevention means stopping illegal acts by juveniles before they occur. To prevent something it is necessary to remove the stimulus for it or to increase the constraints which discourage it. Both the presence of delinquency-inducing stimuli and the absence of delinquency-inhibiting constraints can be seen as causes of delinquency. To prevent delinquency, it is necessary to eliminate its causes. The importance of addressing causes provides a key to the development of the needed system for prevention planning and programing. Different prevention strategies should be identified and distinguished on the basis of causes of delinquency which they address. Then the effectiveness of addressing different presumed causes can be assessed and increasingly effective programs can be developed.

This paper presents a cause-focused typology of 12 delinquency prevention strategies to serve as the needed system. The typology is based on 12 possible causes of delinquency and its control. Each delinquency prevention strategy in the typology addresses one of the presumed causes (see Figure 1, p. 13). Links between the strategies and various theories of delinquency are explored in the paper. The 12 strategies are defined here:

A. BIOLOGICAL/PHYSIOLOGICAL strategies assume that delinquent behavior derives from underlying physiological, biological, or biopsychiatric conditions. They seek to remove, diminish, or control these conditions.

B. PSYCHOLOGICAL/MENTAL HEALTH strategies assume that delinquency originates in internal psychological states viewed as inherently maladaptive or pathological. They seek to directly alter such states and/or environmental conditions thought to generate them.

C. SOCIAL NETWORK DEVELOPMENT strategies assume that delinquency results from weak attachments between youth and conforming members

of society. They seek to increase interaction, attachments, and/or involvement between youth and nondeviant others (peers, parents, other adults) as well as the influence which nondeviant others have on potentially delinquent youth.

D. CRIMINAL INFLUENCE REDUCTION strategies assume that delinquency stems from the influence of others who directly or indirectly encourage youth to commit delinquent acts. They seek to reduce the influence of norms toward delinquency and those who hold such norms.

E. POWER ENHANCEMENT strategies assume that delinquency stems from a lack of power or control over impinging environmental factors. They seek to increase the ability or power of youth to influence or control their environments either directly or indirectly (by increasing the power or influence of communities and institutions in which youth participate). (Efforts to increase community or institutional influence or power over youth are <u>not</u> power enhancement.)

F. ROLE DEVELOPMENT/ROLE ENHANCEMENT strategies assume that delinquency stems from a lack of opportunity to be involved in legitimate roles or activities which youth perceive as personally gratifying. They attempt to create such opportunities. To meet the conditions of role development, roles developed or provided must be perceived by youth as worthwhile (i.e., sufficiently valuable or important to justify expenditure of time and effort). Futher, they must offer youth an opportunity to perceive themselves as either:

   1. Useful (i.e., youth perceives his or her activities contribute to a legitimate social unit the youth values);

   2. Successful (i.e., youth perceives he or she has achieved something desired, planned, or attempted);

   3. Competent (i.e., youth perceives that he or she has achieved mastery over a task).

G. ACTIVITIES/RECREATION strategies assume that delinquency results when youth's time is not filled by nondelinquent activities. They seek to provide nondelinquent activities as alternatives to delinquent activities. The condition which activities strategies seek to achieve (i.e., filling time with nondelinquent activities) is invariably met if the conditions of several other strategies (including role development) are met. Thus, activities strategies are a lowest common denominator in a number of strategies.

H. EDUCATION/SKILL DEVELOPMENT strategies assume that delinquency stems from a lack of knowledge or skills necessary to live in society without violating its laws. Education strategies provide youth with personal skills which prepare them to find patterns of behavior free from delinquent activities, or provide skills

or assistance to others to enable them to help youth develop requisite skills.

I. CLEAR AND CONSISTENT SOCIAL EXPECTATIONS strategies assume that delinquency results from competing or conflicting demands and expectations placed on youth by legitimate organizations and institutions such as media, families, schools, and communities which impinge on the lives of youth. Inconsistent expectations or norms place youth in situations where conformity to a given set of norms or expectations results in an infraction of another set of norms or expectations. This situation can result in confusion as to what actually represents conforming behavior and/or a cynical attitude toward legitimate expectations of any kind. These strategies seek to increase the consistency of the expectations from different institutions, organizations, and groups which affect youth.

J. ECONOMIC RESOURCE strategies assume that delinquency results when people do not have adequate economic resources. They seek to provide basic resources to preclude the need for delinquency.

K. DETERRENCE strategies assume that delinquency results because there is a low degree of risk or difficulty associated with committing delinquent acts. They seek to change the cost-benefit ratio of participation in crime. They seek to increase the cost and decrease the benefit of criminal acts through restricting opportunities and minimizing incentives to engage in crime.

L. ABANDONMENT OF LEGAL CONTROL/SOCIAL TOLERANCE strategies assume that delinquency results from social responses which treat youths' behaviors as delinquent. These responses may be viewed as contributing to delinquency almost by definition. The presence of social intolerance as expressed in the "black letter law," the actions of legal agents, or the attitudes of community members may be viewed as creating opportunities for youthful behavior to be defined as delinquent. In addition, such responses--whether in the general form of rules or in the more specific form of an instance of legal processing--may cause youths whose behaviors are so treated to perceive themselves as "outsiders" and, consequently, to engage in delinquent acts. These strategies seek to remove the label "delinquent" from certain behaviors. They take these behaviors as given and seek to alter social responses to them. Abandonment of legal control removes certain behaviors from the control of the juvenile justice system, thus preventing them from being labeled or treated as delinquent. Increasing social tolerance for certain behaviors decreases the degree to which these behaviors are perceived, labeled, and treated as delinquent.

The paper also discusses the importance of identifying dimensions of delinquency prevention strategies in planning, implementing, and

evaluating delinquency prevention programs. These dimensions are defined in the Appendix.

Finally, the paper explores the utility of the cause-focused typology for planning and evaluating delinquency prevention programs. The typology provides consistent criteria for empirically determining the extent to which a given strategy is actually implemented in a program. Thus, the typology provides a system for moving beyond idiosyncratic evaluations of individual programs and toward assessment of the comparative effectiveness of different cause-focused strategies.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the past two decades, public concern about youth crime has grown. The attention focused on delinquency has defined it as a social problem of serious proportions. Both widespread concern and sociologically based theories and research on the causes of delinquency have stimulated increasing emphasis on the prevention of juvenile crime. In 1967, the Task Force Report on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime stated:

> In the last analysis, the most promising and so the most important method of dealing with crime is by preventing it--by ameliorating the conditions of life that drive people to commit crime and that undermine the restraining rules and institutions erected by society against anti-social conduct (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967:41).

Criminologist LaMar Empey (1978:590) has written:

> ...if society wishes greater protection from juvenile crime more attention has to be paid to the costly process of promoting moral order and of preventing crime.

In the 1970's, this emphasis on prevention was written into Federal law. The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1972, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (PL93-415), and the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1977 established the prevention of juvenile delinquency as a priority.

While prevention has become recognized as an important aspect of juvenile crime control, debate regarding the best prevention methods currently remains intense. Juvenile delinquency is a complex issue influenced by family, school, peer, employment, community, physiological, psychological, and legal variables. The field of delinquency prevention has been marked by the clamor of competing advocates for a variety of approaches targeting different combinations of these variables. A serious problem in this situation has been the absence of a conceptual system or typology organizing the growing body of information regarding delinquency and possible prevention approaches. Such a typology is needed to inform prevention policy and program choices.

This paper presents a typology for distinguishing, ordering, and classifying prevention approaches. It is a typology of conceptually

distinct strategies of delinquency prevention designed to facilitate systematic planning and evaluation of prevention efforts and to allow for comparative assessments of the relative effects of different prevention approaches. The typology should help clarify the prevention policy debate and, ultimately, assist in developing effective prevention policies and programs.

Before presenting the typology, working definitions of delinquency and prevention are needed.[1] Also, criteria for an adequate typology should be established and existing systems for categorizing prevention efforts reviewed.

---

[1]See Cardarelli, 1975:7-17, for an extended review of prior efforts to define these concepts and implications of the absence of common definitions.

CHAPTER II

BASIC CONCEPTS

For present purposes, delinquency is defined as an act committed by a juvenile which violates the law, whether or not the act is detected. It is important to note that this definition of delinquency does not distinguish types or patterns of delinquent behavior. An adequate system for doing so is clearly needed (Cardarelli, 1975:8) because it is highly likely that different patterns of delinquent behavior are most effectively addressed by different strategies of delinquency prevention. To date, the literature advocating particular approaches to delinquency prevention has largely failed to address this issue (see, for example, Johnson et al., 1979). However, it is beyond the scope of this paper to develop a system for categorizing types of delinquency. The goal here is to develop a typology for distinguishing among different strategies for prevention.

It is also important to note that the definition of delinquency used here depends on the laws of the particular jurisdiction in which the act is committed. Levin and Sarri (1974) have documented that widely divergent behaviors are defined as delinquency in different State and local juvenile codes. This divergence has increased as some States have moved to decriminalize "status offenses."

What constitutes delinquency is also subject to wide variations across place, time, and social group. The same behavior may be viewed as "delinquency" by a law enforcement officer, "acting out" by a mental health professional, "sin" by a religious leader, or "mischief" by one who views a certain amount of misbehavior as a normal part of growing up. The responses of community members, parents, school personnel, and legal agents to youths' behaviors vary. In practice, a different range of behaviors than those defined as delinquency in the juvenile code may actually be treated as delinquent acts by those responding to them (Black and Reiss, 1970:63). Differential definitions and responses to youths' behaviors emerge not only from differences in legal definitions of delinquency but also from differences in the perspectives of actors in the social environment.

These considerations make the definition and recognition of delinquency a complex task. They also have important implications for delinquency prevention. They suggest that changes in laws and statutes and changes in the responses of those who seek to control delinquency are possible means of delinquency prevention in addition to changes in physical and social environments and in youths themselves.

For present purposes, delinquency prevention is defined as any attempt to preclude delinquent acts before they occur. Three levels of delinquency prevention have been identified:[2]

---

[2]See United Nations Consultative Group, Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Geneva: United Nations Publication, 1968; and Brantingham and Faust (1976) for formulation of the concept of levels of prevention.

> Primary prevention is directed at modifying conditions in the physical and social environment at large...
>
> Secondary prevention is directed at early identification and intervention in the lives of individuals or groups in criminogenic circumstances...
>
> Tertiary prevention is directed at the prevention of recidivism (after delinquent acts have been committed and detected) (Newton 1978:246).

Of these three levels, primary and secondary prevention most closely approach the essence of the term "prevention" as defined here in that they seek to preclude delinquent acts before such acts occur. Tertiary prevention is "remediation" aimed at forestalling further acts after an initial act has been committed and detected (Lofquist, 1977). Primary and secondary prevention activities are not initiated as a result of apprehension by a law enforcement officer for a delinquent act. The typology presented in this paper seeks to identify distinctive approaches to primary and secondary prevention.

CHAPTER III

DELINQUENCY POLICY AND CAUSE-FOCUSED PREVENTION STRATEGIES: THE NEED FOR A NEW TYPOLOGY

Primary and secondary prevention approaches can only be effective if they address the underlying cause or causes of delinquency (Cardarelli, 1975; Empey, 1978). To prevent a behavior before it occurs, it is necessary to remove the stimulus for the behavior. To the extent that conditions which stimulate delinquent acts and the absence of constraints which inhibit those acts are both viewed as potential causes of delinquency, it is clear that effective prevention approaches must address causes.

Unfortunately, in spite of a great deal of theory development and research, no simple definitive answer regarding the causes of delinquency has emerged. Rather, a number of plausible causes have been suggested. Research has produced varying, and sometimes conflicting, evidence regarding these proposed causes.

As a result, while it is clear that prevention policy and programs should address causes of delinquency, it is not clear which causes should be targeted to have the greatest preventive effect. In this context, policy and practice have proceeded in fits and starts, first emphasizing one approach and then another--depending, in part, on the orientations and persuasions of those who have the ear of policy makers or practitioners at the time (Short, 1975). Existing approaches have repeatedly lost favor to new approaches which, in turn, have been overshadowed by even more recently developed approaches.

The process of experimentation in search of more effective prevention approaches is desirable and expectable. What is unfortunate is that the process has not produced a cumulative knowledge base for developing prevention policies which lead to increasingly effective prevention programs. This failure can be traced to three general problems: (1) inadequate time lines for developing and testing new approaches to prevention; (2) the failure of programs to specify the causes of delinquency they address; and (3) the lack of a conceptual system for planning and evaluating new approaches and for organizing the information derived from these efforts.

Inadequate Time to Develop and Test Prevention Approaches

In an era of public concern over crime rates, there is pressure to find immediate solutions to crime problems. The demand for solutions provides an incentive to try innovations which promise answers quickly. In this context, a particular approach may have only a short time to prove itself before it is abandoned as a major policy thrust. This problem is heightened by the current system of providing short-term (typically 18-month to 3-year) special emphasis or demonstration grants to fund the development of new programs. Because special emphasis and demonstration projects are often initiated in response to pressures to try "promising" new solutions, those who respond to requests for proposals rarely have time to engage in adequate problem identification and assessment, exploratory and descriptive research, and pilot and feasibility studies

before new projects are launched. Program development and planning, mobilization of community support, and refinement of intervention approaches all too often take place after funds are received for a project (National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1978). As a result, special emphasis projects may have just begun to function adequately when funding runs out. Thus, approaches may be abandoned before they are adequately assessed.

Inadequate Specification of Causes

Many programs which seek to prevent delinquency have failed explicitly to identify what they view as the important causes of delinquency (Walker et al., 1976:147). Like many primary prevention programs in other fields, delinquency prevention programs have often been founded on an ideological commitment to primary prevention (Nuehring, 1978). Prevention activities have been based on intuitive assumptions about delinquency and its causes which remain unspecified. As a result, much work in the prevention area has failed to add to the development of a knowledge base regarding which of the many proposed causes of delinquency are most important and which can be successfully addressed.

Lack of an Organizing Framework

A third problem in the development of effective prevention strategies is that no conceptual system for comparing program similarities and differences in terms of causes of delinquency addressed has been available. Evaluations of various prevention initiatives have been conducted on a program-by-program basis without a common framework for integrating and comparing results.[3] As a result, these evaluations have failed to realize their potential to inform subsequent policy and program development by providing systematic evidence regarding the most important causes of delinquency and strategies for best addressing these.

What is needed is a cause-based typology for conceptualizing prevention strategies and for organizing the information derived from evaluations of prevention programs. The typology needed would distinguish prevention strategies from one another on the basis of the cause of delinquency addressed. It would provide clear, consistent criteria for determining the extent to which a given cause of delinquency is actually addressed in a program. This would facilitate program planning and evaluation in several ways. First, it would provide clear links between program goals (i.e., to impact specific presumed causes of delinquency) and program activities. Second, it would allow for comparative evaluations of the extent to which programs have addressed the same or different causes of delinquency. Third, it would provide a basis for assessing the effectiveness of various strategies in addressing particular causes of delinquency. Fourth, it would provide a basis for evaluating whether strategies which effectively address a particular presumed cause of delin-

---

[3]For reviews of these evaluations see Dixon and Wright, 1975; Center for Vocational Education, n.d. vol. 1-4; Lundman, et al., 1976; Newton, 1978.

quency actually prevent delinquent acts. Identification of strategies which effectively impact the important causes of delinquency would inform policy by providing a basis for deciding which prevention approaches should be abandoned and which retained.

To summarize, if prevention policies and programs are ultimately to lead to a reliable technology of effective delinquency prevention, major changes are required in the way prevention programs are conceptualized, funded, planned, and evaluated. Policies and programs should be oriented by a conceptual typology which distinguishes prevention strategies according to the cause or causes of delinquency addressed. Programs should be initiated which explicitly seek to address empirically supported causes of delinquency. The causes to be addressed should be clearly stated in program goals and objectives. Programs should be given sufficient time for developing and testing their cause-focused strategies. Finally, the effectiveness of programs in influencing the presumed causes they address and in preventing delinquency should be rigorously evaluated over a sufficient period of time. This paper presents a cause-based typology of prevention strategies which could provide the organizing conceptual framework for this systematic approach to delinquency prevention.

CHAPTER IV

PRIOR EFFORTS TO CONCEPTUALIZE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

Social scientists have previously attempted to build a conceptual system for deliquency prevention from a base of theories of delinquency and delinquency control. They have reviewed various theories to determine their implications for prevention (Preventing Delinquency, National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, vol. 1, 1977) and have categorized prevention efforts on the basis of levels (i.e., structural, interactional, individual) (Galvin et al., 1977:Chapter 5). Unfortunately, difficulties arise when attempts are made directly to relate theories of delinquency to prevention approaches. A fundamental problem is the fact that there is not a unitary relationship between theories of delinquency and approaches to preventing delinquency. There are two aspects to this problem. First, a single theory of delinquency may imply several approaches to preventing delinquency. Secondly, a given delinquency prevention approach may be consistent with a number of different theories of delinquency.

The first problem can be illustrated using, as an example, Cloward and Ohlin's "opportunity theory" (1960). Briefly, this theory posits that delinquency results when youth lack legitimate means of obtaining conventional goals and, therefore, turn to those illegal means to which they have access. One approach to delinquency prevention consistent with this theory is to provide youth with access to legitimate means such as jobs. But another approach consistent with the theory would be to convince delinquent youth to abandon conventional goals such as material wealth; to lower their aspirations; or to seek alternative, perhaps spiritual, goals. A third approach consistent with opportunity theory would be to reduce youth access to illegitimate means such as burglary and robbery through "target hardening" or other forms of deterrence. As this example illustrates, theories of delinquency do not necessarily imply a single specific prevention approach.

Conversely, a given prevention approach need not correspond directly to a particular theory. Opportunity theory (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960) could provide a basis for implementing an employment program to provide youth with legitimate means of obtaining income. Yet control theory (Hirschi, 1979) could also be used as a basis for implementing an employment program in order to bond potentially delinquent youth more tightly to the conventional order through involvement in and commitment to conventional activities. The lack of unitary correspondence between theories of delinquency and prevention approaches limits the utility of theories for directly classifying delinquency prevention approaches.

An alternative is to identify elements presumed to cause delinquency and to use these presumed causes, rather than full-blown theories, as a basis for defining a set of prevention strategies. With this approach, each strategy is defined as those prevention activities which address a single presumed cause of delinquency. Cause-focused strategies are at a lower level of abstraction than theories of delinquency. They have

the advantage of conceptually linking single presumed causes of delinquency and activities which address those individual causes.

Previous typologies of prevention strategies have failed to categorize prevention activities on the basis of the presumed cause of delinquency addressed. In reviewing the effectiveness of prevention programs, for example, Dixon and Wright (1975) defined 10 "prevention strategies." However, their typology mixes several types of variables in categorizing prevention initiatives. Some strategies in the typology are characterized primarily by organizational sponsorship (juvenile court projects, youth service bureaus); some are characterized by the organizational role of service provided (programs employing volunteers, street-corner workers); some are characterized by the intervention techniques themselves (individual and group counseling, social casework). This mixing of types of variables would not have occurred if the authors had distinguished among strategies on the basis of correspondence to presumed causes of delinquency.

Walker et al., (1976) developed a typology which distinguishes prevention strategies according to intervention approach. The strategies are counseling, recreation, police-school-community relations, instruction, opportunity enhancement, and youth advocacy. Because this typology does not distinguish strategies according to the presumed cause of delinquency addressed, interventions seeking to address quite different causes of delinquency fall into the same strategy category. For example, activities aimed at opposite goals and based on conflicting assumptions about causes of delinquency can be included in the strategy of "youth advocacy" as defined in this typology (see Cardarelli, 1977:7). Efforts to increase the power of juvenile courts to "protect" a wider range of youth as well as efforts to remove youth who have not committed delinquent acts (e.g., "status offenders") from the jurisdiction of juvenile courts could both be considered youth advocacy. Because this typology can be used to aggregate interventions aimed at different causes of delinquency into a single category, it is not useful for comparing approaches focused on different causes of delinquency or for determining the effectiveness of addressing a particular cause of delinquency in a prevention program.

CHAPTER V

CAUSE-FOCUSED STRATEGIES

Presented below is a typology of 12 delinquency prevention strategies and associated substrategies which address 12 causes of delinquency (see Figure 1, p. 13). Each of the 12 strategies is based on an assumption regarding the cause of delinquency; each presumes a goal of intervention aimed at modifying or eliminating the cause. The 12 causes were derived from a review of delinquency prevention programs.

It should be noted that the strategies presented below are ideal types. Prevention programs may utilize combinations of several of these strategies or may not address any presumed causes of delinquency in actual operation (see Walker, et al., 1976:147). However, the typology provides criteria for determining whether prevention programs address presumed delinquency causes and, if so, which causes they address.

A. BIOLOGICAL/PHYSIOLOGICAL strategies assume that delinquent behavior derives from underlying physiological, biological, or bio-psychiatric conditions. They seek to remove, diminish, or control these conditions.

1. Substrategies

a. Health promotion substrategies assume that ill-health is related to delinquent behavior. They attempt to teach, promote, and encourage behaviors which minimize the impact of pathogenic elements in lifestyle and environment.

b. Nutrition substrategies assume that improper diet leads to irritability, reduced attention span, "acting out" behavior, and/or minimal brain dysfunction assumed to be associated with delinquency. They attempt to alter diet, usually to increase protein and decrease carbohydrate intake.

c. Neurological substrategies assume that central nervous system disorders, such as dyslexia, brain damage and certain types of mental retardation ("minimal brain dysfunction"/learning disabilities) result in delinquent behavior. They seek to diagnose and correct or control these disorders.

d. Genetic substrategies assume that delinquency is caused by inherent defects such as endocrine abnormalities (imbalances in levels of male and female hormones) in individuals. They seek to diagnose and correct or control genetic defects.

2. Theory Base

Biological/physiological strategies are consistent with theories which link biological constitution and behavior. They need not be reductionist theories of biological determinism such as the "defective delinquent" theories of the early 20th century. More

recent theories of this type are likely to recognize an interaction between genetic and environmental factors in influencing biological constitution as well as behavior. For example, physiological theories which seek to link minimal brain dysfunction to certain types of delinquency are likely to recognize the influence of socio-economic variables on nutritional and other factors which appear associated with minimal brain dysfunction. (See, for example, Schulte, 1971; Towbin, 1971).

B. PSYCHOLOGICAL/MENTAL HEALTH strategies assume that delinquency orginates in internal psychological states viewed as inherently maladaptive or pathological. These strategies seek directly to alter such states and/or environmental conditions thought to generate them.

1. Substrategies

a. Epidemiological substrategies assume that certain environmental conditions adversely affect psychological processes and lead to delinquent behavior. They seek to develop general awareness or recognition of these environmental conditions and/or to remove or weaken such pathogenic environmental stimuli to prevent possible psychological problems from developing or becoming worse. They include efforts to increase public awareness of mental health problems and recognition of factors, such as stress, contributing to these. Also included are efforts to increase availability of treatment. The substrategy also includes crisis intervention to alter particular social situations or living conditions which are felt to adversely affect psychological processes or development, and thereby increase the likelihood of delinquency.

b. Psychotherapeutic substrategies attempt to develop cognitive understandings of pathogenic conditions and pathological psychological states as a means of eliminating these conditions or changing these states. The focus may be on intrapsychic states of individuals or interpersonal interactions (of units such as families) viewed as pathological or pathogenic. Counseling programs which attempt to help individuals or family members understand the psychological roots of moods, thought patterns, or behavior are examples. Counseling or casework programs which seek to help family members understand how their behaviors contribute to maladaptive/pathological psychological states of their children with behavior problems are also examples.

c. Behavioral substrategies attempt to use social learning principles of "conditioning, extinction, reinforcement, and modeling" directly to change or eliminate "behavior disorders" without attempting to understand the psychological states implicated in the disorders.

It is important to note that behaviorism is a technology which can be applied in seeking to change behaviors which may be rooted in a number of different "causes." Behavioral approaches are based on learning theory which posits that behaviors are responses to constellations of reinforcement

FIGURE 1
CAUSES OF DELINQUENCY
AND ASSOCIATED STRATEGIES OF DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

PRESUMED CAUSE	STRATEGY	GOAL OF STRATEGY
PHYSICAL ABNORMALITY/ ILLNESS	BIOLOGICAL-PHYSIOLOGICAL -Health Promotion -Nutrition -Neurological -Genetic	Remove, diminish, control underlying physiological, biological or biopsychiatric conditions.
PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTURBANCE DISORDER	PSYCHOLOGICAL/MENTAL HEALTH -Epidemiological/early intervention -Psychotherapeutic -Behavioral	Alter internal psychological states or conditions generating them.
WEAK ATTACHMENTS TO OTHERS	SOCIAL NETWORK DEVELOPMENT -Linkage -Influence	Increase interaction/involvement between youth and non-deviant others; increase influence of non-deviant others on potentially delinquent youth.
CRIMINAL INFLUENCE	CRIMINAL INFLUENCE REDUCTION -Disengagement from criminal influence -Redirection away from criminal norms	Reduce the influence of delinquent norms and persons who directly or indirectly encourage youth to commit delinquent acts.
POWERLESSNESS	POWER-ENHANCEMENT -Informal influence -Formal power	Increase ability or power of youth to influence or control their environments, directly or indirectly.
LACK OF USEFUL WORTHWHILE ROLES	ROLE DEVELOPMENT/ ROLE ENHANCEMENT -Service roles -Production roles -Student roles	Create opportunities for youth to be involved in legitimate roles or activities which youth perceive as useful, successful, competent.
UNOCCUPIED TIME	ACTIVITIES/RECREATION	Involve youth in non-delinquent activities.
INADEQUATE SKILLS	EDUCATION/SKILL DEVELOPMENT -Cognitive -Affective -Moral -Informational	Provide individuals with personal skills which prepare them to find patterns of behavior free from delinquent activities.
CONFLICTING ENVIRONMENTAL DEMANDS	CLEAR AND CONSISTENT SOCIAL EXPECTATIONS	Increase consistency of expectations/ messages from institutions, organizations, groups which affect youth.
ECONOMIC NECESSITY	ECONOMIC RESOURCES -Resource maintenance -Resource attainment	Provide basic resources to preclude the need for delinquency.
LOW DEGREE OF RISK/ DIFFICULTY	DETERRENCE -Target hardening/removal -Anticipatory intervention	Increase cost, decrease benefits of criminal acts.
EXCLUSIONARY SOCIAL RESPONSES	ABANDONMENT OF LEGAL CONTROL/ SOCIAL TOLERANCE -Explicit jurisdictional abandonment -Implicit jurisdictional abandonment -Covert jurisdictional abandonment -Environmental tolerance	Remove certain behaviors from control of the juvenile justice system; decrease the degree to which youths' behaviors are perceived, labeled, treated as delinquent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

conditions present in an environment. Behavioral interventions seek to change undesirable behaviors by altering reinforcements. In this respect, any presumed "causes" of delinquency which can be viewed as reinforcement conditions are amenable to behavioral interventions. Behavioral techniques can be applied to problems caused by psychological maladjustment, lack of skills, lack of power, criminal influences in the environment, inadequate socialization, or inconsistent environmental expectations. Only behavioral interventions which seek to eliminate behaviors rooted in psychological maladjustment are included in the behavioral substrategy of psychological/mental health strategies. Behavioral interventions which seek to remedy problems resulting from other underlying causes of delinquency fall into other strategies in this typology. For example, behavioral interventions which seek to enhance individuals' influence in interactions fall into the power enhancement strategy (see E below). Behavioral interventions used to assist individuals to develop reading skills fall into the cognitive education strategy (see H below).

2. Theory Base

Some of these strategies are consistent with psychodynamic (Freud, 1962), developmental (Erikson, 1963), and other personality-based theories of psychopathology which emphasize early acquisition of deviant personality traits. Other are consistent with moral/ interactional (Rogers, 1951) theories or with existential theories (Laing, 1959) which emphasize a continual process of psychological adaptation in response to environmental constraints. Finally, some psychological/ mental health strategies are consistent with social learning theories which view psychopathology as a result of improper learning and, therefore, subject to modification through carefully scheduled reinforcements (Akers, 1973; Bandura, 1969). However, all of these strategies assume that such psychological maladjustment, pathology, or disorder motivates youth to commit delinquent acts.

C. SOCIAL NETWORK DEVELOPMENT strategies assume that delinquency results from weak attachments between youth and conforming members of society. They seek to increase interaction, attachment, and/or involvement between youth and nondeviant others as well as the influence which nondeviant others have on potentially delinquent youth.

1. Substrategies

a. Linkage substrategies attempt to promote bonds or attachments between nondeviant others (peers, parents, other community members) and youth through increased interaction and involvement. Big Sisters programs and programs which involve youth with other school or community participants in planning or carrying out projects are examples. (The latter programs may use both power enhancement and role development strategies as well. See E and F below.)

b. Influence substrategies attempt to expose youth to informal norms, sanctions, and/or controls of nondeviant others through interaction. They assume that such exposure will increase the immediate social constraints on youth as well as encourage youth to develop norms which promote nondelinquent behaviors. Peer counseling is an example.

2. Theory Base

Social network development strategies are consistent with control and containment theories and cultural deviance theories. They are especially consistent with a cultural deviance theory which focuses on social interaction processes called differential associated theory.

Control and containment theories posit that inadequate socialization precludes development of "self-control" or inner containment mechanisms which would prevent delinquency (Horton, 1966; Reckless et al., 1956; Reckless, 1961). According to control theorists, inadequate socialization also results in poor social bonding to the larger society. This lack of bonding leads to an absence of commitment to conventional values and immunity to social constraints (or outer containment mechanisms) which would regulate behavior and hence prevent delinquency (Hirschi, 1969).

The attempts of network strategies to establish linkages with conforming individuals and to strengthen social bonds to increase youth susceptibility to the influence of conforming others are consistent with control theory. However, while the causal assumptions underlying network strategies are consistent with control theory, the emphasis some prevention programs place on peers as agents of social control is less consistent with the view of those control theorists who see families, schools, and the law as the significant units of control (see Hirschi, 1969). Efforts to strengthen social bonds between youth and parents are more consistent with the views of these control theorists.

In contrast to control theory, cultural deviance theories clearly recognize the influence of delinquent peers and their values on behavior (Cohen, 1955; Matza and Sykes, 1961; Miller, 1958; Shaw, 1929; Shaw and McKay, 1942; Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967). These theories are consistent in viewing delinquency as emerging from subcultures which have values different from the "conventional" dominant society, though they posit different causes or sources of subcultural values. In these theories, delinquency is seen as conformity to deviant subcultural values.

Social network development strategies are consistent with cultural deviance theories to the extent that they view attachments to others as a source of delinquency or conformity. However, social network development interventions which rely primarily on interaction between "conforming" others and "deviant" youth are not

consistent with all cultural deviance theories. Some cultural deviance theorists view commitments to delinquent subcultures and their values as structurally generated. Miller (1958), for example, argues that lower-class cultural values are antithetical to dominant middle-class value and are a source of delinquency. To the extent that deviance reflects commitments to structurally generated values, it may not be prevented by association with those who hold different values.

Like other cultural deviance theories, differential association theory recognizes the influence of peers and their values on behavior. However, this theory emphasizes the development of values throught face-to-face interaction and association with others. The theory views association with small groups of others who hold or encourage delinquent values as the source of delinquent behavior (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970). Thus, social network development strategies which seek to create new linkages or associations between "conforming" and potentially deviant young people are highly consistent with differential association theory.

D. CRIMINAL INFLUENCE REDUCTION strategies assume that delinquency stems from the influence of others who directly or indirectly encourage youth to commit delinquent acts. They seek to reduce the influence of delinquent norms and those who hold such norms.

1. Substrategies

a. Disengagement substrategies seek to decrease interactions and attachments between youth and others who encourage youth to commit delinquent acts. Attempts to disband violent youth gangs are examples.

b. Redirection substrategies seek to reorient communities, groups, or individuals away from criminal or deviant norms. Community organization projects which seek to organize community members against crime or which attempt to neutralize the criminal value system are examples. Detached gang worker projects which seek to redirect delinquent gangs to more socially acceptable behaviors and norms are also examples.

2. Theory Base

Criminal influence reduction strategies are consistent with cultural deviance theories (including differential association theories) in seeking to reduce the influence of criminally inclined others and/or criminal norms on youth.

It is important to distinguish between criminal influence reduction strategies and social network strategies. Programs may use both strategies in seeking to prevent delinquency. However, these

are distinct strategies because their fundamental assumptions about the causes of delinquency are not simply the obverse of one another. Social network strategies attach the absence of attachments to conventional others as the cause of delinquency. Criminal influence reduction strategies attack the influence of deviant others as a cause of delinquency. Social network strategies do not necessarily postulate that delinquency results from attachments to deviant others. In fact, control theories, with which social network strategies are consistent, postulate that delinquency results when youth are weakly bonded to others rather than from strong bonds to groups or individuals who influence youth toward criminal activities (Hirschi, 1969). Thus, criminal influence reduction strategies are <u>not</u> consistent with control theories, while social network strategies are.

E. <u>POWER ENHANCEMENT</u> Strategies assume that delinquency stems from a lack of power or control over impinging environmental factors. They seek to increase the ability or power of youth to influence or control their environments either directly or indirectly (by increasing the power or influence of communities and institutions in which youth participate). (Efforts to increase community or institutional influence or power <u>over</u> youth are <u>not</u> power enhancement.) Giving youth voting membership on community boards, involving youth in school governance, encouraging communities to lobby for their interests with city, county, or State governmental bodies, and giving parents and students decisionmaking roles in school districts are examples.

1. Substrategies

   a. <u>Informal influence</u> substrategies seek to increase youths' influence with others in informal interactions.

   b. <u>Formal power</u> substrategies seek to alter institutional or structural arrangements to provide youth with roles of legitimate power in social contexts. Examples include family contracts which give youth clear rights and responsibilities within the family unit and creation of decisionmaking roles for students in planning school curriculums and in school governance.

2. Theory Base

   Power enhancement strategies are extremely consistent with Marwell's (1966) suggestion that adolescent delinquency is an active response to powerlessness and a need for power. Marwell posits that, in American society, late adolescence is a crisis period during which young people seek to develop personal sources of power at a point when they are "devoid" of attributes and are denied resources which are sources of such power. Marwell

suggests that adolescents turn to delinquency to provide power in the eyes of peers to remedy this situation of powerlessness.

Power enhancement strategies are also consistent with opportunity or strain theories (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Cohen, 1955; Merton, 1937; Ohlin, 1973). These theories assume that people desire to conform to the conventional order, but that some people, specifically those from ethnic minority and lower-class backgrounds, encounter structural impediments to achievement of conventional values such as economic success (Merton, 1973) or high status (Cohen, 1955). Opportunity theories postulate that people may engage in delinquency when they become frustrated by an absence of opportunities to achieve legitimate goals through legitimate means. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) suggest that in situations of blocked opportunity, the kind of delinquency likely to emerge ("criminal," "conflict," "retreatist") depends on the extent of access to illegitimate opportunities. By increasing young peoples' legitimate power to influence institutions and organizations affecting their lives, power enhancement strategies can decrease blocked opportunities for youth and are, therefore, consistent with opportunity or strain theories.

Power enhancement strategies are also consistent with conflict theories of deviance (Quinney, 1969) which view criminal laws as a means by which powerful groups control less powerful groups and which view many criminal acts by less powerful individuals as an attempt to increase their power. Finally, these stategies are consistent with social contract theories of justice which emphasize participation by all members of society in policy-making. Social contract theorists (Barker, 1968; viii-xlvi; Rawls, 1971) see participation as a means of promoting commitment to the moral order and hence of insuring conformity.

F. ROLE DEVELOPMENT/ROLE ENHANCEMENT strategies assume that delinquency stems from a lack of opportunity to be involved in legitimate roles or activities which youth perceive as personally gratifying. They attempt to create such opportunities. To meet the conditions of role development, roles developed or provided must be perceived by youth as worthwhile (i.e. sufficiently valuable or important to justify expenditure of time and effort). Further, they must offer youth an opportunity to perceive themselves as either:

a. Useful (i.e. youth perceives that his/her activities contribute to a legitimate social unit the youth values);

b. Successful (i.e. youth perceives that he/she has achieved something desired, planned, or attempted); or

c. Competent (i.e. youth perceives that he/she has achieved mastery over a task).

1. Substrategies

   a. Service role substrategies provide opportunities for youth to meet the needs of others through service activities. Examples include cross-age tutoring programs, chore services for the elderly, and crisis lines in which youth provide services.

   b. Production role substrategies provide opportunities for youth to participate in creating products for consumers. Examples include programs which provide jobs in youth-run toy repair businesses and which find jobs for youth in private industry.

   c. Student role substrategies seek to enhance the educational experiences of youth so that they perceive their roles as students as worthwhile and so that their experiences in these roles provide a sense of usefulness, success, and/or competence. Examples include ground school training and certification for youth interested in becoming pilots and programs which teach fundamental reading and math skills necessary for repairing automobiles to youth interested in auto mechanics.

   Programs may use role development/role enhancement strategies in combination with other strategies. For example, programs which involve youth in political activities, in planning school programs, or in school governance use both role development and power enhancement strategies. Programs which provide one with vocational training as well as jobs may use both education and role development strategies.

   It should be noted that the important indicators of the presence of role development/role enhancement strategies are youths' perceptions of their roles as worthwhile and their participation in these roles as competent, successful, or useful. The examples mentioned above may or may not meet these conditions. In assessing whether a program uses a role development strategy, it is important to ascertain whether roles developed or provided are perceived by youth as having these characteristics.

2. Theory Base

   Role development strategies are consistent with opportunity/strain theory which postulates that deviance occurs when people are denied the opportunity to attain the rewards of the conventional social order through legitimate means (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; 1955; Merton, 1937; Ohlin and Cloward, 1973). At the same time, role development strategies are consistent with control theories which postulate that delinquency results from weak or inadequate bonds to the conventional social order. Hirschi (1969) defines these bonds as involvement in conventional activities, commitment to conventional activities, belief in the conventional moral order, and attachment to conventional others. Role develop-

ment strategies seek to remedy weaknesses in social bonding by increasing youth involvement in and commitment to conventional activities.

G. ACTIVITIES/RECREATION strategies assume that delinquency results when youths' time is not filled by nondelinquent activities. They seek to provide nondelinquent activities as alternatives to delinquent activities. The condition which activities strategies seek to achieve (i.e. filling youth time with nondelinquent activities) is invariably met if the conditions of several other strategies (such as role development) are met. Thus, activities strategies are a lowest common denominator in a number of strategies. Pure activities strategies are found in recreational and cultural activities such as attending baseball games, going to concerts or museums, going on camping trips, or participating on a sports team. Other activities which fill youth time, such as involvement in a legitimate job, may use economic resource and role development strategies as well as the activities strategy.

1. Theory Base

Activities strategies are marginally consistent with control theories in that they assume that youth not involved in conforming activities may engage in deviant activities, but this linkage to theory is weak. Control theory postulates more elements of the social bond than mere involvement in conventional activities (Hirschi, 1969). Additionally, research has shown that involvement in conventional activities is not, by itself, sufficient to prevent delinquency without the presence of other bonding elements. Further, activities strategies do not necessarily assume inadequate bonding or poor socialization as fundamental causes of delinquency as does control theory. In general, activities strategies are not well grounded in theories of delinquency.

H. EDUCATION/SKILL DEVELOPMENT strategies assume that delinquency stems from a lack of knowledge or skills necessary to live in society without violating its laws. Education strategies provide individuals with personal skills which prepare them to find patterns of behavior free from delinquent activities, or provide skills to others to enable them to help youth develop requisite skills.

1. Substrategies

a. Cognitive education substrategies focus on acquisition of knowledge and/or intellectual skills. Remedial reading and math courses are examples.

b. Affective education substrategies seek to increase skills for effective functioning in a social world. Included are identity clarification skills (values clarification and self-awareness), interpersonal communication skills (including conflict resolution skills), and decisionmaking skills.

c. Moral education substrategies seek to instill norms for conforming participation in society. Examples are religious education programs and school civics classes which attempt to teach youth their responsibilities under the law.

d. Informational substrategies seek to increase youths' knowledge about specific topics related to delinquency. Law-related education projects which provide information on the legal system and classes on the effects of psychoactive drugs are examples of informational approaches.

In contrast to psychological/mental health strategies, education strategies see delinquency as indicating that something is lacking rather than that something is wrong with the individual. In this respect, education strategies assume that each person must accumulate certain skills to survive without resorting to delinquency. In contrast to role development and activities strategies, the emphasis in education strategies is less on providing activities as a direct alternative to delinquency and more on preparing individuals, through skill development, to find patterns of behavior free from delinquent activities. In activities and role development strategies, participation itself is viewed as the means to prevention. In education strategies, the means to preventing delinquency is through developing specific skills.

2. Theory Base

Education strategies are consistent with social learning theories, opportunity/strain theories, and control theories discussed earlier. Affective education substrategies are also consistent with the views of researchers who suggest that social and interactional difficiencies are a source of delinquent acts (Short and Strodtbeck, 1965).

I. CLEAR AND CONSISTENT SOCIAL EXPECTATIONS strategies assume that delinquency results from competing or conflicting demands and expectations placed on youth by legitimate organizations and institutions such as as media, families, schools, and communities which impinge on the lives of youth. Inconsistent expectations or norms place youth in situations where conformity to a given set of norms or expectations results in an infraction of another set of norms or expectations. This situation can result in confusion as to what actually represents conforming behavior and/or a cynical attitude toward legitimate expectations of any kind. Thus, a high school student who is sent home from school for disrupting a class and who is picked up for truancy may come to view legitimate authority as hopelessly confused or even absurd. The unwed teenaged mother who is expelled from high school for being pregnant might need to find a job to support her child. If she is told that she cannot apply for a job without a high school diploma, she may feel that the inconsistency of the situation means that conventional expectations of any kind are impossible to satisfy. Similarly, educators, law enforcement, and health officials in a community may provide youth with conflicting messages regarding the dangers of drugs such as marijuana. Such conflicting messages may lead

to youth cynicism toward authority. This prevention strategy seeks to increase the consistency of the expectations and messages from different legitimate institutions, organizations, and groups which affect youth. Programs which seek to organize or coordinate community groups and institutions so that they provide clear and consistent messages to youth regarding expectations for behavior are examples.

1. Theory Base

The strategy is consistent with Matza's (1964) view that youth engage in rationalizations ("techniques of neutralization") which free them from moral constraints and allow them to commit delinquent acts. According to Matza, the ideology of child welfare in the juvenile system creates perceptions of injustice in the system, thereby facilitating rationalizations for criminal acts. To the extent that programs minimize perceived inconsistencies and injustices in the system, they can decrease the basis for such rationalizations.

The strategy is also consistent with cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1962) which holds that when placed in a situation of conflicting expectations, an individual will seek to reconceptualize the situation to resolve the dissonance. When conformity in one sphere automatically results in deviance in another, an individual may experience dissonance. If this is not resolved, the individual may conclude that any attempts at conformity are futile.

Finally, the strategy is consistent with opportunity strain theory (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960) and other theoretical systems derived from Durkheim's (1966) theory of anomie which posit that delinquency results when society does not regulate expectations and aspirations consistently (see Merton, 1957:176-194).

J. ECONOMIC RESOURCE strategies assume that delinquency results when people do not have adequate economic resources. They seek to provide basic resources to preclude the need for delinquency.

1. Substrategies

a. Resource maintenance substrategies provide resources such as financial support, housing, and food on the basis of need or status. While recipients must often take initiative to learn about, apply for, and obtain these resources, resources are not exchanged for work or other activity in these substrategies. Examples are Aid to Families with Dependent Children and other public assistance programs.

b. Resource attainment substrategies provide opportunities to attain financial or other resources in exchange for one's legitimate efforts/work. Examples are Youth Entitlement Employment programs.

2. Theory Base

Economic resources strategies are consistent with opportunity/strain theories of deviance discussed earlier (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960). Economic resource strategies are also consistent with some conflict theories which assert that the powerful avoid undesired consequences of an unequal distribution of wealth (e.g. uncontrolled delinquency and revolution) by providing minimal economic resources to low income people (Dahrendorf, 1967).

K. DETERRENCE strategies assume that delinquency results because there is a low degree of risk or difficulty associated with committing delinquent acts. They seek to change the cost-benefit ratio of participation in crime. They seek to increase the cost and decrease the benefit of criminal acts through restricting opportunities and minimizing incentives to engage in crime.

1. Substrategies

a. Target hardening/removal involves increasing the immediate difficulty and/or the potential cost of participation in delinquent behavior. Examples include security guards at schools, lights on park and recreation areas, and increased criminal penalties for delinquency.

b. Anticipatory intervention attempts to limit the access of juveniles to situations in which delinquent behavior might arise or to opportunities to commit delinquent acts. Examples include identification checks at taverns or zoning to locate taverns away from schools. Anticipatory intervention is also expressed in various juvenile "status offenses": behaviors which are criminal or subject to legal control only for juveniles and not for adults. Making such behavior as truancy, running away from home, and possession of alcohol subject to legal control is an attempt to limit the access of juveniles to places or substances and to limit the mobility of juveniles. The general purpose is to restrict or limit involvement in activities or situations thought likely to lead to delinquent behaviors.[4]

2. Theory Base

The theoretical orientation of this strategy is an amalgamation of classic utilitarianism (Bentham, 1961) and sociological ex-

---

[4]The rationale behind this approach is similar to the rationale behind the laws of criminal attempt. To prove attempt, one must prove intent plus substantial progress toward consummation of the criminal act. In status crimes the element of intent is less salient: In practice they approach strict liability offenses. Furthermore, their commission does not represent substantial progress toward a specific criminal act by merely assumed progress toward "becoming delinquent."

change theory (Blau, 1964). It finds its fullest expression in the contemporary deterrence theories of Andenaes (1971); Zimring and Hawkins (1973); and Gibbs (1975). These theories view individuals as rational actors who attempt, through their actions, to maximize benefits. The threat of discovery and/or legal sanctions represents potential costs in order to remove the incentive to engage in crime. Certain aspects, especially "target hardening" substrategies, involve technological processes (e.g., burglarproof glass) which are essentially atheoretical (cf. Jeffery, 1977).

L. ABANDONMENT OF LEGAL CONTROL/SOCIAL TOLERANCE strategies assume that delinquency results from social responses which treat youths' behaviors as deviant. From an interactionist perspective, delinquency is created when people respond to behavior as if it is delinquent (Becker, 1963). The presence of social "intolerance" as expressed in the "black letter law," the actions of legal agents, or the attitudes of community members may be viewed as creating opportunities for youthful behavior to be defined as delinquent. In addition, such responses--whether in the general form of rules or in the more specific form of an instance of legal processing--may cause youth whose behaviors are so treated to perceive themselves as "outsiders" and, consequently, to engage in delinquent acts.

These strategies seek to remove the label "delinquent" from certain behaviors. They take these behaviors as given and seek to alter social responses to them. The abandonment of legal control removes certain behaviors from the control of the juvenile justice system, thus preventing them from being labeled or treated as delinquent. Increasing social tolerance for certain behaviors decreases the degree to which these behaviors are perceived, labeled, and processed as delinquent.

1. Substrategies

   a. Explicit jurisdictional abandonment substrategies seek to remove certain behaviors from the jurisdiction of the criminal justice system through legal or administrative action. Removal of "status offenses" from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court is an example.

   b. Implicit jurisdictional abandonment substrategies remove jurisdiction from the criminal justice system on a case-by-case basis. An example is a police officer's decision to return a youth caught drinking to parents without further referral to the legal system.

   c. Covert jurisdictional abandonment substrategies involve informal or tacit agreements that are not publicly acknowledged, such as police agreements with juvenile court officers to return juveniles to their parents without referral after a minor first offense.

d. Social tolerance substrategies seek to increase levels of community tolerance for certain juvenile behaviors, such as "hanging out," which could be viewed as delinquent or troublesome by some actors in the environment.

2. Theory Base

These strategies are highly consistent with labeling theories of deviance which postulate that:

> Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders (Becker, 1963:9 emphasis in original).

According to labeling theorists, labeling processes do not depend solely on the existence of laws or statutes defining delinquency. They also occur when people respond to an individual as if the individual is deviant or delinquent. Labeling theorists postulate that such societal responses cause people to believe that the label is accurate and to behave according to the expectations of others, as delinquents (Lemert, 1967). By seeking to decriminalize certain youthful behaviors and/or to increase tolerance for them by both agents of formal legal control and others in the environment who may invoke legal controls for youthful behaviors, these strategies seek to forestall the labeling process and, thereby, to prevent the recognition and treatment of certain youthful behaviors as delinquency.

Finally, abandonment of legal jurisdiction may be viewed as consistent with social contract theories of justice (cf. Raws, 1971). When the criminalized status of certain behaviors (e.g. juvenile status offenses, "victimless" crimes) is perceived as unjust, decriminalization of such behavior may serve to encourage conformity in other areas. Such policy changes could result in the legal system being perceived as more "just" and, therefore, more deserving of commitment in the form of conformity.

CHAPTER VI

CAUSE-FOCUSED VERSUS TRADITIONAL STRATEGIES

Because the foregoing strategies are keyed to assumptions about the causes of delinquency, they do not include some terms commonly used to describe prevention activities such as "youth advocacy," "community organization," and "opportunity enhancement." These terms so not have specific commonly shared meanings (Cardarelli, 1977:41). Rather than use them, their conceptual components have been isolated as these appear related to specific causes of delinquency. Each component has then been identified as a distinct strategy.

For example, "youth advocacy" activities which assume that delinquency results when youth experience a lack of power or control over impinging environmental factors and which seek to provide greater power to youth are power enhancement strategies here. "Youth advocacy" activities which assume that delinquency results from exclusionary social responses and which seek greater social tolerance for youths' behaviors are abandonment of legal control/social tolerance strategies. "Youth advocacy" activities which assume that delinquency stems from a lack of opportunity to be involved in roles or activities which youth perceive as useful and which attempt to create such opportunities for youth are role development strategies.

Similarly, "opportunity enhancement" has been separated into conceptual components. According to Cardarelli, early "opportunity enhancement" programs were based on the assumption that delinquency results when society does not provide access to legitimate opportunities for youth. They focused on providing legitimate opportunities (primarily jobs) to adolescents residing in low income areas. More recent "opportunity enhancement" programs have assumed that youth are inadequately prepared or socialized to take on legitimate roles in the larger society (Cardarelli, 1977:36-38). These recent "opportunity enhancement" programs have focused on remedying individual youth's inadequate cognitive or social skills (Cardarelli, 1977:36). In the typology presented here, programs based on the former causal assumption are considered role development strategies if they provide socially acceptable roles which youth perceive as worthwhile and useful. Programs based on the assumption that youth do not have adequate skills to assume legitimate roles and which help them develop such skills use an education/skills development strategy. In summary, "youth advocacy" and "opportunity enhancement" have been subdivided here into conceptual components distinguished by the cause of delinquency addressed.

The present typology of prevention strategies also diverges from others in that it does not rely on the distinction between individual, interactional, and structural level interventions as a basis for categorizing prevention strategies. Intervention level and cause are not directly related. Interventions at a particular level may address

quite different causes of delinquency while interventions at different levels may seek to address the same presumed cause of delinquency.

For example, those who assume that delinquency results when youth are precluded from worthwhile roles may intervene at a structural level by seeking special minimum wage standards for teenagers or the passage and enforcement of legislation which ensures equal opportunities for low income and minority youth. Alternatively, they may intervene at an individual level by helping young people find personally satisfying jobs or by providing them with vocational training.

Because the same presumed causes of delinquency may be addressed by structural, interactional, or individual level interventions, level of intervention is viewed as a dimension of each cause-based strategy in the typology designating the social unit in which the intervention is made.

The foregoing discussion of intervention levels raises a more general issue which should be noted. Cause-focused prevention strategies may be expressed in a number of forms in prevention programs. Programs which use a particular strategy may differ from one another in several respects. They may, for example, focus on different target populations; intervene at different points in the temporal development of the problem presumed to cause delinquency; intervene with formal organizations, face-to-face groups, or individuals; last for varying periods of time; take place in a wide range of settings; and use varying amounts of resources. Differences in such variables may be associated with effectiveness. To assess the effectiveness of various prevention strategies, it is necessary to control or assess the effects of these other variables as well. They can be viewed as dimensions of prevention programs. In planning and evaluating prevention programs, it is important to define the dimensions of the program. Important prevention program dimensions are described in the Appendix of this paper.

CHAPTER VII

THE UTILITY OF A CAUSE-FOCUSED TYPOLOGY FOR PREVENTION PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

The typology presented here distinguishes prevention strategies according to the assumed cause of delinquency addressed. By doing so, it provides a framework within which prevention policies and programs can be planned and results of prevention efforts organized to contribute to a cumulative body of knowledge regarding how to effectively prevent delinquency. The typology is useful for this purpose only to the extent that the "causes" that prevention programs seek to address are made explicit. Where programs' assumptions about causes of delinquency and strategies for addressing these are not identifiable, the typology cannot be used to identify the programs. Evaluations of these programs cannot be used to inform policy regarding which causes can be most effectively addressed. Therefore, in planning for prevention activities, the causes to be targeted and cause-focused strategies to be used by a policy or program should be clearly identified. Program objectives should be framed in terms of changes in the presumed causal variables targeted by the program.

The typology can also help systematize process evaluations of prevention programs. It provides criteria for empirically determining the extent to which a given cause-focused strategy is actually operating in a program. A series of questions about any program can be asked such as:

A. Does the program remove, diminish, or control biological/physiological conditions thought to cause delinquency?

B. Does the program increase interaction/involvement between youth and nondelinquent others?

C. Does the program provide or develop roles which youth perceive involve them in useful activities?

D. Does the program increase social tolerance for youthful behaviors viewed as delinquent?

Answers to these questions will allow classification of programs according to the prevention strategies actually used.[5] Once a program has been reliably classified according to the presumed cause(s) of delinquency it addresses, the effectiveness of its intervention strategy (or strategies) in preventing delinquency can be assessed.

Assessing the extent to which strategies are implemented in programs before using program results as indicative of strategy effectiveness

---

[5]Assuming that all strategies operating within a given program are identified, and assuming that appropriate means of measuring the degree of implementation for each strategy are applied, it should be possible to analyze the impact of a particular strategy or combination of strategies by controlling for (i.e., "factoring out") specific interactive effects.

is important. Erroneously equating program and strategies can risk using program evaluation results as a basis for abandoning viable strategies that simply have not been adequately implemented.

An example will illustrate. Numerous studies have shown a relationship between youth unemployment and crime (Glaser and Rice, 1959; Fleisher, 1966; Greenberg, 1978; Votey and Phillips, 1974). Youth employment programs have been advocated and implemented. Yet, evaluations of these programs have not shown them to be consistently effective in preventing youth crime (Glaser, 1978:59). These results could be interpreted as indicating that youth employment as an approach for delinquency prevention is ineffective and should be abandoned. Yet, this is likely to be an unwarranted conclusion because different programs categorized under this label actually represent a wide range of strategies of delinquency prevention. Grouping employment programs as if they represent a single prevention strategy obscures the numerous presumed causes of delinquency which such programs may seek to address. Employment programs may use an activities strategy to seek to provide nondelinquent activities for youth. They may use an education strategy to help youth develop the needed skills. They may use an economic resource strategy to preclude the need for economically motivated crime. They may use a role development strategy by providing youth with opportunities to engage in activities they view as useful. They may use a power enhancement strategy by providing youth with decisionmaking roles in program planning. They may use a social network strategy by integrating youth of different ages with older, successful workers from similar socioeconomomic backgrounds (see Glaser, 1978:60). A youth employment program may succeed in implementing none, one, or some combination of these strategies.

Further, some strategies may be successfully implemented with some program participants and not with others. For example, some youths in a program may perceive they have useful roles while others do not. The role development strategy is only development strategy; outcomes for those youth who perceive they have useful roles must be distinguished from those who do not. Delinquent acts by youth who do not perceive they have been provided useful roles by a program may indicate program failure, but they do not indicate failure of the role development strategy. The extent to which any strategy is implemented in a program must be determined before program results are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

This typology of cause-focused prevention strategies provides a basis for systematic and cumulative policy planning and for evaluating the relative effectiveness of generic strategies for delinquency prevention applied at different points and levels of intervention in different settings with different intensity and duration. A systematic approach grounded in the typology will allow development of a cumulative body of knowledge regarding the most promising programs to fund and evaluate. Development of reliable prevention technologies is a long-term goal. If a consistent conceptual system is not used for planning and research, prevention policy planning will remain haphazard and unsystematic, and each prevention program evaluation will remain an idiosyncratic study of an individual program.

APPENDIX:

PREVENTION PROGRAM DIMENSIONS

I. LEVEL OF INTERVENTION

Level of intervention designates the social unit in which the intervention is made. Level of intervention is conceptually distinct from level of impact. (See II below.) Three levels of intervention have been distinguished.

A. Structural level. Interventions with formal organizations or institutions are structural level interventions. Interventions with a State legislature, a school board, or a labor union are examples.

B. Interactional level. Interventions with existing primary groups whose members communicate with one another often over a span of time in face-to-face interactions are interactional level interventions. Interventions with nuclear families, classroom, and groups of peers are examples.

C. Individual level. These are interventions with individuals.

II. LEVEL OF IMPACT

Level of impact refers to the type of social unit which the intervention seeks directly to change. The three levels of this dimension are defined below.

A. Structural level. Efforts which seek to attack supra-individual or supra-interactional factors and structural arrangements (e.g. the economic system; school curriculums; legal processing) seek structural level impact (Parsons, 1971). Programs which seek to enhance the power of a community or neighborhood in the city or State where it is located; efforts to increase the number of jobs available to youth through changing minimum wage standards for teenagers or including youth in Affirmative Action Guidelines; efforts to reduce workplace stress through statutes requiring breaks during the workday; and mandatory education requirements are examples of programs focused on structural level impact.

B. Interactional level. Efforts to create changes within face-to-face interpersonal groups (e.g. families, classrooms, or peer groups) seek interactional level impact. Examples include family counseling programs, peer counseling projects, detached gang workers, and affective education programs which seek to help teachers provide classroom environments more conducive to learning.

C. Individual level. Effort to change individuals to address a presumed cause of delinquency seek an individual impact. Examples include individual counseling and vocational training.

Distinguishing programs according to levels of intervention and impact should allow more rigorous investigation of an issue debated in delinquency prevention. A number of authors have argued for the viability of a structural level focus. Others favor focusing on individual or interactional levels. Yet, investigation of the importance of the level of intervention in determining prevention effectiveness is compounded by the fact that interventions at different levels may seek to affect different presumed causes of delinquency. By allowing categorization of programs according to cause(s) addressed, the present typology of strategies should facilitate assessment of the relative effectiveness of attacking a given cause or constellation of causes at different levels.

III. POINT OF INTERVENTION

It is possible to distinguish the temporal point of an intervention in the development of a cause of delinquency. The point of intervention can be characterized according to the population targeted. Interventions may be restricted to certain population on the basis of the extent of perceived risk of delinquency initiation.

A. General population interventions are directed to a general population without regard to risk of development of the cause. They represent the most "primary" of prevention approaches. Examples include media campaigns aimed at helping people recognize and cope with stress; parent effectiveness training programs offered to all parents in a school district; affective education programs for drug abuse prevention offered to all students in a school district; and youth employment services available to all youth such as "job line" telephone referral services.

B. High risk population interventions are directed to a population thought to be especially at risk of becoming delinquent because it has characteristics related to causes of delinquency. Examples include parenting programs for teenaged mothers thought to be at high risk of child abuse; alcohol education programs for children of alcoholic parents; and youth employment programs for youth from low income families.

C. Identified problem population interventions are directed to a population which has indicated symptoms of a condition thought to cause delinquency. While these may be viewed as remediation efforts with regard to the presumed cause of delinquency, they are considered primary or secondary delinquency prevention efforts because they can be initiated before youths have engaged in or been apprehended for delinquent behaviors. Examples are alternative education programs for disruptive youths; counseling programs for youths in conflict with their families; companionship programs for youths identified as social isolates; and programs which train and use disruptive youths as tutors.

D. Mixed population interventions are explicit attempts to include people from two or more of the preceding categories as targets of an intervention. Peer counseling groups whose members are

consciously selected to include both representatives of the general population and those thought to be high risk youth provide an example.

It should be emphasized that an intervention at any of these points may affect youth already engaged in delinquent behavior. Yet, so long as intervention with any of these populations does not depend on prior commission of or apprehension for delinquent acts, such intervention can be viewed as primary or secondary prevention.

Programs seeking to address the same cause of delinquency (i.e., programs which apply the same strategy) may be targeted to different points of intervention. For example, cognitive education strategies aimed at providing necessary skills for survival may be provided to general populations, as in the traditional educational system; to high risk populations, as in Head Start programs for children of low income parents; or to identified problem populations, as in tutoring or alternative education programs for children who have not developed cognitive skills at a rate comparable with others of their age. Similarly, abandonment of legal jurisdiction may affect general populations, as when status offenses are removed from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court; high risk populations, as when police decide not to patrol certain establishments known to be frequented by runaways or truants; or identified problem population, as when police decide to refrain from picking up individual youth they contact who may have committed status offenses.

Some researchers, such as those who advocate "youth development" approaches, favor general population interventions as delinquency prevention approaches (see Polk and Kobrin, 1972; Center for Action Research, 1978). Others argue that because so many youths engage in delinquent careers, it is more effective to intervene only with high risk or identified problem populations Clarke, 1974). Use of the "point of intervention" dimension to distinguish programs within a given strategy should allow assessment of the relative effectiveness of intervention with different populations in preventing delinquency.

IV. INTERVENTION SETTING

A third dimension which distinguishes interventions within a number of strategies is the environment or context in which the intervention takes place.

A. Home setting interventions take place in the environment where youths live their daily lives. Youth work training programs, in-school tutoring programs, and community mental health clinics attempt to intervene in the home setting.

B. Special setting interventions take place in an environment away from the locale in which their impact is ultimately desired. Outward Bound, Job Corps, and residential treatment programs use special settings.

Some researchers have suggested that interventions which take place in the home setting are more effective than interventions in special settings (see, for example, Romig, 1978; Fairweather et al., 1979). On the other hand, a number of programs, such as "Outward Bound," remove youths to special settings in attempting to work with them more effectively. Distinguishing programs which seek to address the same cause of delinquency in different settings allows investigation of the importance of setting in delinquency prevention.

V. DURATION AND INTENSITY OF INTERVENTION

Two additional dimensions are duration and intensity of intervention. Duration is the period over which interventions occur. Intensity indicates the proportion of available time and the amount of resources used in a given program (e.g., financial resources, level of expertise, number of people delivering services, and the like). These dimensions are likely to influence both the outcome and cost effectiveness of programs.

REFERENCES

Akers, Ronald L.
1973 Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach. (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth).

Andenaes, Johann
1971 "Deterrence in Specific Offenses." University of Chicago Law Review. 38:537-553.

Bandura, Albert
1969 Principles of Behavior Modification. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston).

Barker, Ernest
1968 Social Contract: Essays by Locke, Hume and Rousseau. (London: Oxford University Press).

Becker, Howard S.
1963 Outsiders. (New York: Free Press).

Bentham, Jeremy
1961 An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. (New York: Hafener (1789)).

Black, Donald J., and Albert J. Reiss, Jr.
1970 "Police Control of Juveniles." American Sociological Review. 35:63-77.

Blau, Peter M.
1964 Exchange and Power in Social Life. (New York: Wiley).

Boland, Barbara, and James Q. Wilson
1978 "Age, Crime and Punishment." The Public Interest. 51 (spring): 22-34.

Brantingham, Paul J., and Frederick L. Faust
1976 "A Conceptual Model of Crime Prevention." Crime and Delinquency. 22,3:284-296.

Cardarelli, Albert P.
1973 Socio-Economic Status and Delinquency and Adult Criminality in a Birth Cohort. Unpublished dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

1975 The Theory and Practice of Delinquency Prevention in the United States. Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University. (Prepared for National Evaluation Program, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice.)

1977 Delinquency Prevention in the United States: A Synthesis, and Assessment of Program Strategies. (Presented at Annual Meeting of American Society of Criminology.)

Center For Action Research
1978 Capacity Building of One Pilot Project Suggesting an Approach to Local Institutional Reform. Boulder, Colo. (Prepared for Youth Development Bureau, Office of Human Development Services, Department of HEW.)

Center For Vocational Education
n.d. A Profile of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Projects in the United States. Ohio State University. Volume 1-4. (Prepared for National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, LEAA, U.S. Department of Justice.)

Clarke, Stevens H.
1974 "Juvenile Offender Treatment Programs and Delinquency Prevention." Crime and Delinquency Literature. 6,3 (September):377-399.

Cloward, Richard A., and Lloyd E. Ohlin
1960 Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. (New York: Free Press).

Cohen, Albert K.
1955 Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. (New York: Free Press).

Dahrendorf, Ralı
1967 Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press).

Dixon, Michael C., and William E. Wright
1975 Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs. (Nashville, Tenn.: Peabody College for Teachers).

Durkheim, Emile
1975 Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Trans. John A. Spaulding and George Simpson; ed. George Simpson. (New York: Free Press).

Erikson, Erik H.
1963 Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton).

Empey, LaMar T.
1978 American Delinquency: Its Meaning and Construction. (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey).

Fairweather, G. W., D. H. Sanders, H. Maynard, and D. L. Cressler
1969 Community Life for the Mentally Ill: An Alternative to Institutional Care. (Chicago, Illinois: Aldine).

Festinger, Leon
1962 A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press).

Fleisher, Belton M.
1966 The Economics of Delinquency. (Chicago: Quadrangle Books).

Freud, Sigmund
1962 A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis. Trans. Joan Riviere. (New York: Washington Square Press).

Galvin, James L., Kenneth Polk, Don Gibbons, Cheryl H. Ruby, and Garry Coventry
1977 Youth and Delinquency. (San Francisco: NCCD Research Center).

Gibbs, Jack
1975 Crime, Punishment and Deterrance. (New York: Elsevier).

Glaser, Daniel
1978 "Coping With Socioculture Causes of Youth Employment and Crime." In Crime and Employment Issues. American University Law School, Institute for Advanced Studies in Justice. (Prepared for Office of Research and Development, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor).

Glaser, Daniel, and Kent Rice
1959 "Crime, Age and Employment." American Sociological Review. 24 (October):679-686.

Gold, Martin
1966 "Undetected Delinquent Behavior." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 3,1(January).

Greenberg, David F.
1978 "The Dynamics of Oscillatory Punishment Processes." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. No. 69.

Hardt, Robert H., and George E. Bodine
1975 Development of Self-Report Instruments in Delinquency Research. (Syracuse, N.Y.: Youth Development Center, Syracuse University).

Hirschi, Travis
1969 Causes of Delinquency. (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Horton, John
1966 "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems." American Journal of Sociology. May:701-713.

Jeffery, C. Ray
1977 Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage).

Johnson, Grant, Tom Bird, and Judith W. Litter
1979 Delinquency Prevention: Theories and Strategies. (Arlington, Va.: Westinghouse National Issues Center).

Laing, R.D.
1959 The Divided Self. (London: Tavistock).

Lemert, Edwin
1967 Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control. (New York: Prentice-Hall).

Legins, Peter
1967 "The Field of Prevention." Eds. William E. Amos and Charles E. Wellford. Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall).

Levin, Mark E., and Rosemary C. Sarri
1974 Juvenile Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis of Legal Codes in the U.S. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Lofquist, William A.
1977 "Defining and Operationalizing Prevention - A Major Human Service Task." The Arizona Technical Assistance Review. (Tucson, Ariz.) (November-December).

Lundman, Richard J., Paul T. McFarlane, and Frank R. Scarpitti
1976 "Delinquency Prevention. A Description and Assessment of Projects Reported in the Professional Literature." Crime and Delinquency. (July):297-308.

Marwell, Gerald
1966 "Adolescent Powerlessness and Delinquent Behavior." Social Problems. 14,1(Summer):35-47.

Matza, David
1964 Delinquency and Drift. (New York: John Wiley & Sons.)

Matza, David, and Gresham M. Sykes
1961 "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values." American Sociological Review. 26:712-719.

Merton, Robert K.
1937 "Social Structure and Anomie." American Sociological Review. 3(October):672-682.

1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. (New York: Free Press.)

Miller, Walter B.
1958 "Lower-Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency." Journal of Social Issues. 14(Summer):5-19.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency
1978 Preliminary Report of the National Evaluation of Prevention. (San Francisco: duplicated report).

National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
1977 Preventing Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis of Delinquency Prevention Theory. Volume I of IX. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice.

Nuehring, Elane M.
1978 "The Technological Character of Barriers to Primary Preventive Activities in Mental Health: A Framework for Analysis." Administration in Social Work. 2,4:451-468.

Newton, Anne M.
1978 "Prevention of Crime and Delinquency." Criminal Justice Abstracts. (June):245-266.

Ohlin, Lloyd, and Richard Cloward
1973 "The Prevention of Delinquent Subcultures." Eds. Martin S. Weinburg and Earl Rubington. The Solution of Social Problems. (New York: Oxford University Press).

Parsons, Talcott
1971 The Systems of Modern Societies. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall).

Polk, Kenneth, and Soloman Kobrin
1972 Delinquency Prevention Through Youth Development. Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, U.S. Department of HEW.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice
1967 Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.

Quinney, Richard
1969 Crime and Justice in Society. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company).

Rawls, John
1971 A Theory of Justice. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Reckless, Walter
1961 The Crime Problem. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.)

Reckless, Walter, C. Simon Dinitz, and Ellen Murray
1956 "Self Concept As an Insulator Against Delinquency." American Sociological Review. 21:744-746.

Rogers, Carl T.
1951 Client-Centered Therapy. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.)

Romig, Dennis
1978 Justice for Our Children: An Examination of Juvenile Delinquent Rehabilitation Programs. (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company.)

Schulte, F. J.
1971 "Current Concepts in Minimal Brain Dysfunction." Journal of the American Medical Association. 217,9(August):1237-1238.

Shaw, Clifford R.
1929 Delinquency Areas. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Shaw, Clifford R., and Henry D. McKay
1942 Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Short, James F., Jr.
1975 "The Natural History of an Applied Theory: Differential Opportunity and Mobilization for Youth." Social Policy and Sociology 193-210.

Short, James F. and Fred L. Strodtbeck
1965 Group Processes and Gang Delinquency. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Silberman, Charles E.
1978 Criminal Violence and Criminal Justice. (New York: Random House).

Sutherland, Edwin H., and Donald R. Cressey
1970 Principles of Criminology. (New York: J. B. Lippincott).

Towbin, Abraham
1971 "Organic Causes of Minimal Brain Dysfunction." Journal of the American Medical Association. 217,9(August):1207.

Vaz, Edmund W.
1967 Middle Class Juvenile Delinquency. (New York: Harper and Row).

Votey, Harold L., Jr. and Llad Phillips
1974 "The Control of Criminal Activity: An Economic Analysis." Ed. Daniel Glaser. Handbook of Criminology. (Chicago: Rand-McNally).

Walker, Jerry P., Albert P. Cardarelli, and Dennis Billingsley
1976 The Theory and Practice of Delinquency Prevention in the United States: Review, Synthesis and Assessment. Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University. (Prepared for National Evaluation Program. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.)

Weis, Joseph G.
1974 Delinquency Among the Well To Do. (Unpublished dissertation, Berkeley: University of California.)

1977 "Comparative Analysis of Social Control Theories of Delinquency." Preventing Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis of Delinquency Prevention Theory. Volume I of IX. National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice.

Wolfgang, Marvin E., and Franco Ferracuti
1967 The Subculture of Violence: Toward an Integrated Theory in Criminology. (London: Tavistock).

Wolfgang, Marvin E., Robert M. Figlio, and Thorsten Sellin
1972 Delinquency in a Birth Cohort. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Zimring, Franklin, and Gordon J. Hawkins
1973 Deterrence: The Legal Threat in Crime Control. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1981 O - 341-233 (1841)